

Appl. No.: 09/855,042
Amdt. dated 18 Oct 2005
Reply to Final Office Action of 19 July 2005

II. REMARKS

This paper is being filed concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 and is intended to be a complete response to the above-identified Final Office Action. No claims have been added or cancelled by this Reply. Accordingly, claims 1-21 are currently pending in the instant application.

A. Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-4, 8-11, and 15-18 are allowed.

B. Section 112 Rejections

In paragraphs 2-3 of the Final Office Action, Examiner rejected claims 5-7, 12-14 and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. It appears that the Examiner objects to the claims for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the word "occasion" in the written description of Applicants' specification. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(d)(1) & MPEP 608.01(o). Although the Applicant is allowed to be his own lexicographer, claims 5, 12, and 19 have been amended to replace the term "occasion" with -- event -- so that the claim terminology is consonant with terminology in the written description. For example, the specification describes that the method is implemented by the occurrence of two events (*e.g.*, "by the occurrence of an event, such as when the user turns on or restarts the computer system onto which system 200 is installed" at page 6, lines 14-16 and when "an installation process...occurs, such as when the user turns on the computer system again." Furthermore, the summary of the invention also describes that the method is implemented upon the occurrences of triggering events (*e.g.*, "[u]pon a triggering event, such as each time the user turns the client computer on" at page 2, lines 19-20 and again "at the next event described above" at page 3, line 15.)

Appl. No.: 09/855,042
Amdt. dated 18 Oct 2005
Reply to Final Office Action of 19 July 2005

For at least these reasons, claims 5-7, 12-14 and 19-21 are believed allowable, and Applicants respectfully request allowance of these claims in the next paper from the Office.

CONCLUSIONS

Reconsideration of claims 5-7, 12-14 and 19-21 in light of the above remarks is respectfully requested. If, after considering this reply, the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be beneficial towards advancing this case to allowance, the Examiner is strongly encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at the number listed.

10-18-2005

Date

Sean McDermott
Sean McDermott
Reg. No. 49,000

Wong, Cabello, Lutsch, Rutherford & Brucculeri, L.L.P.
20333 SH 249, Ste 600
Houston, TX 77070
832/446-2416
832/446-2424 (facsimile)

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark	
Office Facsimile No. 571-273-8300	on Date: <u>10-18-2005</u>
<u>Sean McDermott</u> Signature	
<u>Sean McDermott</u> Typed or Printed Name of Person Signing Certificate	